

Appl. No.: 10/786,407  
Reply to Final Office Action of: May 25, 2005

### Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 stand rejected. The following remarks are addressed to the referenced paragraphs of the Final Office Action dated May 25, 2005.

#### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner contends that the particular structure and arrangement of the "transition region" is not clear. All reference to the transition region has been deleted from claim 1 rendering this rejection moot.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the Examiner asserts that "designed to be" and "designed so as" do not clearly define structure. Claims 5 and 6 were previously amended to remove this language and so that rejection was previously overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 and 6 is requested. Claim 5 is currently amended to address a minor typographical error.

#### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Shibata, et al. (US 5,945,900).

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites elements neither taught nor suggested by Shibata, et al., and therefore is believed to be patentably distinct from Shibata, et al., since that reference does not teach nor suggest a pair of cross-sectional enlargements located along end faces of the core in combination with a central region located between the cross-sectional enlargements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

Appl. No.: 10/786,407  
Reply to Final Office Action of: May 25, 2005

contend that claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1, and Applicants respectfully contend that claims 2-14 are allowable for the reason that claim 1 is allowable.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a), as being unpatentable over Shibata, et al., in view of Martino (US 5,084,688).

Since Shibata, et al. does not teach nor suggest the elements of claim 1 as previously stated, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 3 is allowable for the reasons that claim 1, from which it depends, is allowable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue or an advisory action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayments associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Salvatore Anastasi  
Registration No. 39,090  
Attorney for Applicants  
Phone: 610.889.3697  
Facsimile: 610.889.3696  
PTO Customer No.: 29450